arXiv:hep-th/0605184v3 3 Nov 2006

Transitions Between Flux Vacua

S. P. de Alwis

Perimeter Institute, 31 Caroline Street N.,

Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada and

Department of Physics,

University of Colorado,

Box 390, Boulder, CO 80309.

e-mail: dealwis@pizero.colorado.edu *PACS : 11.25. -w, 98.80.-k*

Abstract

A dynamical description of the transitions between different backgrounds requires the existence of a background independent action which propagates the correct number of degrees of freedom and couples bulk supergravity to certain higher dimensional branes. We present classical equations for configurations that separate the world into regions with different flux parameters etc. and discuss the difficulties of trying to construct an action that describes the transitions between them within the framework of supergravity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The realization that the solutions to the equations of string theory can give in four dimensions a large multiplicity of vacua (called the landscape) has led to much discussion as to whether there is a dynamical selection principle that picks one or a class of these vacua, or whether we simply find ourselves living in a universe where observers such as ourselves can exist. The former consists principally of arguments from quantum cosmology and seems to apply only to closed universes. In any case it is not clear that it can help resolve the cosmological constant problem. The latter goes under the name of the Anthropic Principle and it is not clear whether it is little more than a tautology. At best it may help resolve the so-called cosmic coincidence problem. In any case both approaches become meaningful only within a theory in which there is a mechanism by which the different universes can be realized.

In this paper we will discuss dynamical processes in the landscape, by which transitions between vacua with different flux quantum numbers and different numbers of branes can take place [1],[2],[3]. Of course the landscape will also consist of different compactification manifolds. Even if we restrict ourselves to Calabi-Yau compactifications there are of the order of 10^5 manifolds with different numbers of two and three cycles. We do know that through conifold transitions one can change these topological numbers, but it is not clear that there is a dynamical process which describes this in string theory [25]. On the other hand it is widely believed that such a process does exist for changing flux quanta and the number of D-branes. Here we will be concerned with this.

We will discuss only type IIB and IIA compactifications. Moduli stabilization issues in the heterotic and M-theory cases are less well understood. We will show that there are indeed classical configurations that describe a variety of transitions. However the processes involve the nucleation of various higher dimensional branes. These are branes which are magnetically coupled to the fields in the bulk theory. In the case of type IIB these will be 5-branes (either NSNS or RR) and in the case of IIA they will be 6- and 8-branes. The process however is essentially quantum mechanical. The existence of a classical configuration which divides space into two regions separated by a domain wall (i.e. the nucleated higher dimensional brane) by itself does not mean that the process of nucleation can take place. For this, at the very least, one should be able to construct an action for the bulk fields and

the brane. We attempt to do this here in the low energy (i.e. supergravity) limit of string theory.

In type IIB we have an immediate problem in that the self-duality condition for the five-form field does not permit us to write a (Lorentz invariant) action. This problem is usually addressed by imposing the self-duality condition at the level of the equations of motion. We adopt this procedure tentatively (even though it is not a proper action for a quantum theory) and write down the coupling to three and five-D-branes and orientifold planes. We discuss in detail the classical equations and the transitions between flux vacua. We show how to construct a bulk action magnetically coupled to the five brane by using the phenomenon of anomaly inflow. However at the end of the day it turns out that this action is inconsistent with the self duality constraint. In other words although in the absence of the five-brane there is no inconsistency, once the five brane is introduced the equations of motion and Bianchi identities are inconsistent with the self-duality constraint.

It might be thought that an alternative procedure would be to consider a non-Lorentz invariant action for type IIB since one is breaking the (10 dimensional) Lorentz invariance anyway. However the self-duality condition involves the metric, and an implementation of it which picks out the four directions of the external space will be dependent on the background geometry of the space. This is more than just a topological restriction to work in spaces of the form $M_4 \times X_6$, it depends also on the metric on M_4. This is manifestly unsuited to a discussion of processes which change the background - in particular the cosmological constant is changed by these processes. It can hardly be over-emphasized that such a discussion must necessarily be made only with a background independent formulation [26].

Since in the IIB case this problem might be attributed to the lack of a proper action even in the absence of the nucleated five-brane, it is reasonable to expect that there is no problem in IIA, where there is no such self-duality constraint. We discuss in detail the classical equations (Bianchi identities) that lead to flux changing processes resulting from the nucleation of D6 and D8 branes. After some manipulations we find that it is indeed possible to construct a bulk action coupled to 6 and 8- branes for the massive IIA theory [27] that is gauge invariant. However this action is explicitly dependent on the background fluxes.

Now it could still be the case that although there is no semi-classical description, the complete formulation of string theory contains a quantum mechanical description of these

processes. On the other hand it seems to us that since it is assumed that classical flux compactification arguments that lead to moduli stabilization and the landscape, survive in the full string theory, the absence of a background independent semi-classical description of transitions might also survive. If that is so it would mean that each point in the landscape is simply a model and there is no need to ascribe any degree of reality to any of them except the one (if it exists) that contains the standard model with a tiny cosmological constant. On the other hand given that a classical configuration that divides space into two different regions does exist, it is arguable that the technical point highlighted in this paper will be overcome in the full string theory, and that a quantum process of brane nucleation of these higher dimensional branes is in fact allowed.

II. STRING THEORY PROCESSES

A. Type IIB

A concrete framework in which such a discussion can be made is that of Kachru et al. [4] (see also[5]). Here the nucleation of a NS5 branes that take the form of a S_2 bubble wall in non compact four dimensions and sweeps out an S_3 in the six dimensional Calabi-Yau manifold X, is discussed within the GKP context. The flux constraint coming from the Bianchi identity for the five-form flux is

$$\frac{\chi}{24} = N_3 - \bar{N}_3 - \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2 T_3}\int_X H_3 \wedge F_3 \tag{1}$$

where $H_3(F_3)$ are NSNS(RR) three form fluxes χ is the Euler character of the associated Calabi-Yau 4-fold in the F-theory context (alternatively the LHS is the contribution of orientifold planes in the purely six dimensional context). Assuming that that there is only one pair of crossed fluxes (setting $2\pi\alpha' = 1$)

$$\int_A F_3 = 2\pi M, \int_B H_3 = -2\pi K \tag{2}$$

(1) becomes

$$\frac{\chi}{24} = N_3 - \bar{N}_3 - KM \tag{3}$$

The argument of [4] is that the nucleation of NS five-branes will change the flux on the cycle dual to the one that's wrapped by the five brane $K \to K \pm 1$ so that by the

above equation the net number of D3 branes will change by M. So by such a transition one would expect a string theory realization of the BT process. Obviously this process explores only points on the landscape which all belong to a given F-theory compactification (or CY orientifold) but it is still important to establish whether this can actually take place and be described in semi-classical terms.

Everything that was said above will have an S-dual counterpart. Clearly a dual process would be one in which a D5 brane (wrapping the B cycle) is nucleated so that $M \rightarrow M \pm 1$ with the number of D3 branes changing by $\mp K$. Since D5 brane actions are better understood than NS five branes we will focus on this rather than its S-dual. Our aim is to see whether an action which describes these D3 brane configurations interpolated by a D5 brane exists.

Since the dilaton-axion system is irrelevant for our considerations let us freeze them by putting $e^{\phi} = 1$ and $c_0 = 0$. The form of the bulk action (for the gauge fields) is

$$\begin{aligned} S_{IIB} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}}[-\frac{1}{4}F_5 \wedge *F_5 - \frac{1}{2}H_3 \wedge *H_3 - \frac{1}{2}F_3 \wedge *F_3] \\ &+\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{D_{11}} F_5 \wedge F_3 \wedge H_3 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The last (topological) term is integrated over a eleven disc whose boundary is the ten manifold M_{10}. In the absence of sources the integrand is closed due to the Bianchi identities (given below) so that the integral is independent of the particular disc over which the definition of the fields is extended, provided also that the integral over an arbitrary closed 11-manifold is ($(2\pi)^4$ times) an even integer (see for example [6]). The field strengths satisfy the Bianchi identities

$$dH_3 = 0, dF_3 = 0 \tag{5}$$

$$dF_5 = H_3 \wedge F_3, \tag{6}$$

which are solved locally by

$$H_3 = dB_2 \qquad F_3 = dC_2 \tag{7}$$

$$F_5 = dC_4 - H_3 \wedge C_2. \tag{8}$$

In the absence of sources or non-trivial F_5 flux the last integral in the action can be written as

$$\int_{M_{10}} C_4 \wedge F_3 \wedge H_3.$$

The equations of motion and the self-duality constraint are

$$d * F_3 = F_5 \wedge H_3, \qquad d * H_3 = F_3 \wedge F_5, \tag{9}$$

$$F_5 \; = \; *F_5. \tag{10}$$

Note that the local solution to the Bianchi identities are RR fields which are related to the ones given in [7] by the substitution $C_4 \to C_4 + \frac{1}{2} B_2 \wedge C_2$ [28]. The gauge transformations are as follows.

$$\delta B_2 \; = \; d\Lambda_1, \, \delta C_4 = 0, \tag{11}$$

$$\delta C_2 \; = \; d\tilde{\Lambda}_1, \, \delta C_4 = -H_3 \wedge \tilde{\Lambda}_1, \tag{12}$$

$$\delta C_4 \; = \; d\tilde{\Lambda}_3. \tag{13}$$

The WZNW part of the D3 brane action is then the usual one

$$I_3 = \frac{\mu_3}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_4} [C_4 - C_2 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2], \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = B_2 + f_2. \tag{15}$$

Here f_2 is the world volume gauge field strength which under the gauge transformation (11) transforms as $\delta f_2 = d\Lambda$, and $\mu_3 = (2\pi)^2 q_3$ ($q_3 = \pm 1, 0$ for D3, an anti-D3 or no D3). (14) is invariant under (11,12,13). If this is coupled to the bulk action (i.e. $q_3 = \pm 1$) then the Bianchi identity (6) is modified. The C_4 equation of motion for the total action $S_{IIB} + I_3$ and self-duality of F_5 gives

$$dF_5 = H_3 \wedge F_3 - 2\mu_3 \delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4) + \ldots. \tag{16}$$

where the ellipses denote the contributions of orientifold planes (or D7 brane contributions in the case of F-theory). However it was argued in footnote 6 of GKP [8] that in deriving this from the action for the D3 brane, the topological term needs to be taken as half the value given in (14). This is related to the fact that because of the self duality of the D3 brane the electric and magnetic couplings are identical. Thus in GKP the above relation is written as

$$dF_5 = H_3 \wedge F_3 - \mu_3 \delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4) + \ldots. \tag{17}$$

This formula in fact plays a crucial role in the GKP analysis. It should be mentioned here that (as emphasized by GKP) the action is still supposed to be taken to be the sum of the

type IIB bulk action and the D3 brane action (i.e. without any relative coefficient such as a factor half). In particular GKP use the gravitational variation of the DBI part of the action in their analysis and of course the relation between the coefficient of that part (the tension) and the charge μ_3 is fixed by supersymmetry. In fact it is easy to see that this is the equation that is consistent with the equation of motion for the RR C_2 field. In the presence of the coupling to the three brane (14) the first equation of (9) is modified to

$$d * F_3 = F_5 \wedge H_3 + \mu_3 \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge \delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4) \tag{18}$$

Requiring consistency with $d^2 = 0$ gives

$$0 = dF_5 \wedge H_3 + \mu_3 H_3 \wedge \delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4)$$

where we've used the fact that $d\mathcal{F}_2 = H_3$. Clearly this is consistent only with (17). This justifies the choice made by GKP. What goes wrong with (16) is that it is really an equation of motion i.e. gives us from the Lagrangian $d*F_5$, which does not conflict with (18) by itself. A (gauge invariant) Lagrangian cannot give inconsistent equations of motion! It is really the imposition of the self-duality constraint (10) that creates a problem. Unfortunately this means that there is no (Lorentz invariant) Lagrangian formulation of the bulk action coupled to D3 branes that is consistent with self duality of the five form, even if the latter is imposed by hand at the level of the equations of motion.

Now let us try to couple D5 branes to the bulk IIB action. First of all it should be emphasized that there is no way of coupling the six-form field C_6 to the bulk action. There are two related problems in doing this. One could proceed as usual to dualize by introducing a Lagrange multiplier to switch the Bianchi identity and the EOM of the three form field C_2 effectively replacing $\pm * F_3 \to F_7 = dC_6 + \ldots$. If one just had the kinetic term for C_6 then indeed this would make sense and writing the coupled action as

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{M_{10}} [-\frac{1}{2} F_7 \wedge * F_7] + \frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_6} C_6,$$

we would get the the equation of motion for C_6 which would be the Bianchi identity for F_3-namely,

$$dF_3 = \pm d * F_7 = -\mu_5 \delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6). \tag{19}$$

However the problem is that this dualization cannot be carried out in the full IIB action. The C_2 form cannot be removed from the action since it occurs explicitly (i.e. not just

through its curvature) in the (local) solution to the Bianchi identity for $\tilde{F}_5$. Furthermore both C_4 and C_2 occur in the D5 brane action for precisely the same reason - namely gauge invariance. In fact a similar situation is encountered in trying to dualize the M-theory action to couple M5 branes and for a detailed discussion of the problems that one encounters in that case see [6][9]. The resolution is the same. We drop the higher form terms entirely from the action and simply impose the Bianchi identity. The dropped terms will then reappear in the bulk action as Dirac string terms. Let us see how this works in detail.

The topological terms in the action for a D5 brane, in the form in which can couple to the above bulk action are,

$$I_5 = \frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_6}[-C_4 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2 + \frac{1}{2!}C_2 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2^2] \tag{20}$$

Here $\mu_5 = 2\pi q_5$ ($q_5 = \pm 1, 0$ for D5, a D-bar 5 or no D5) and $\mathcal{F}_2 = B_2 + f_2$, as before except that now the field f_2 lives on the world volume W_6. Note that we have omitted the $\int C_6$ term since this gauge field is absent from the bulk action. Instead [29] we require that the Bianchi identity for C_3 is changed from (5) to

$$dF_3 = 2\lambda^{-1}\mu_5\delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6) \tag{21}$$

The coefficient in front of the delta function in the above will be fixed by gauge invariance. Both the topological term in the bulk action as well as that in the five brane action are now separately anomalous under the gauge transformation (13) which leaves the bulk action (4) invariant in the absence of sources, i.e. with zero on the RHS of (21). In the eleven dimensional form of the topological term, the presence of the five brane means that the integrand of the topological term (the second line of (4) is ambiguous. We choose to fix this ambiguity by imposing gauge invariance of the combined system bulk plus brane.

$$S_{top} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}}[\frac{\lambda}{2}C_4 \wedge F_3 \wedge H_3 + \frac{1-\lambda}{2}C_4 \wedge F_3' \wedge H_3] \tag{22}$$

where F_3 obeys the Bianchi identity (21) and $dF_3' = 0$ so that locally $F_3' = dC_2$. In fact we may write $F_3 = F_3' + \theta_3$ where θ_3 (the Dirac string term) may be defined as the coexact solution to (21). Given this the second term is gauge invariant but because of (21) the first gives

$$\delta S = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{\lambda}{2}\int \tilde{\Lambda}_3 \wedge dF_3 \wedge H_3 = \frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_6}\tilde{\Lambda}_3 \wedge H_3. \tag{23}$$

Let us now look at the gauge variation of the five brane action (20). First note that under the B_2 gauge variation $\delta f_2 = -d\Lambda_1$ so that $\mathcal{F}_2$ is gauge invariant. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta I_5 &= \frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_6}[-(d\tilde{\Lambda}_3 - H_3 \wedge \tilde{\Lambda}_1)\wedge \mathcal{F}_2 + \frac{1}{2}d\tilde{\Lambda}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2^2] \\ &= -\frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_6}\tilde{\Lambda}_3 \wedge H_3 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

In the last line above we used the formula

$$d\mathcal{F}_2 = dB_2 + dF_2 = H_3 \tag{25}$$

where in the last equality we used the Bianchi identity for the gauge field strength on the five-brane world volume. Thus the combined action $S + I_5$ of bulk IIB SUGRA plus the six brane is gauge invariant by the phenomenon of anomaly inflow.

The coefficient λ in (21) can now be fixed by requiring the consistency of the Bianchi identity for the five form field when the bulk is coupled to the five brane action (20). Again as was the case in the coupling of the D3 brane, the C_4 equation of motion (and the self-duality constraint) gives the wrong answer by a factor of two. The correct result is

$$dF_5 = H_3 \wedge F_3 + \mu_5 \mathcal{F}_2 \delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6) + \ldots \tag{26}$$

since it must agree with (17) when the D5 brane contains a dissolved D3 brane. In detail this may be seen by comparing the two equations after integrating over the six manifold and giving a unit magnetic flux $\int_{S_2} f_2 = -2\pi$ and using the relation $\mu_3 = 2\pi\mu_5$. Then consistency with $d^2 = 0$ (and the use of the formula $d\mathcal{F}_2 = H_3$) gives $\lambda = 2$ in (21). So the Bianchi identity is

$$dF_3 = \mu_5 \delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6) \tag{27}$$

which is the same as (19) if we choose the negative sign in the first equality.

Suppose that the nucleated D5 brane wraps the spatial directions $S_2 \times S_3^B$ where the first factor is in the non-compact space and the last is a three (B) cycle in X. Integrating (27) over $R \times S_3^A$ where the factor R is a radial direction going from inside the bubble (whose wall is an S_2) to the outside and S_3^A is the cycle dual to S_3^B, we get

$$\int_{R\times S_3^A} dF_3 = \Delta \int_{S_3^A} F_3 = \pm(2\pi) \tag{28}$$

i.e. the RR flux (2) changes by one unit $M \to M \pm 1$ as one goes from inside the bubble to outside or vice-versa.

Now let us consider the topological terms for the D3 branes. These branes have boundaries which are attached to the D5 brane. Now since the world volume has boundaries we have from (14,12,13)

$$\delta I_3 = \frac{\mu_3}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\partial W_4} (\tilde{\Lambda}_3 - \tilde{\Lambda}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2). \tag{29}$$

If the boundary of this D3 brane lies on the D5 brane there is effectively a monopole on the D5 brane world volume wrapping an S_3 cycle in X so that $df_2 \neq 0$ on the D5 brane world volume. Thus there is an uncanceled piece in the gauge transformation of I_5,

$$\delta^+ I_5 = -\frac{\mu_5}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_6} (\tilde{\Lambda}_3 - \tilde{\Lambda}_1 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2) \wedge df_2. \tag{30}$$

Now on the D5 brane we have

$$d\mathcal{F}_2 = H_3 + df_2$$

Integrating this over the S_3 in X wrapped by the D5 brane and using the fact that $\mathcal{F}_2$ (unlike f_2) is globally defined we have

$$\int_{S_3} df_2 = -\int_{S_3} H_3 = 2\pi K,\ K \varepsilon \mathcal{Z} \tag{31}$$

Thus the monopole equation is

$$df_2 = 2\pi \sum_i q_i \delta_3(S_3 \to i) \tag{32}$$

with

$$\sum_i q_i \equiv N_3 - \bar{N}_3 = K \tag{33}$$

where $N_3(\bar{N}_3)$ are the number of D3 (D-bar3) branes ending on this D5 brane. Substituting (32) into (30) and using $\mu_5 = 2\pi$, $\mu_3 = (2\pi)^2$ we see that the gauge variation of the D3 brane action is cancelled by anomaly inflow from the D5 brane. Thus we have shown that the total action

$$S_T = S_{IIB} + I_5 + \sum_i I_{3i} \tag{34}$$

is gauge invariant.

The modified Bianchi identity (replacing (17) and (26) is

$$dF_5 = H_3 \wedge F_3 + \mu_5 \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge \delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6) - \sum_i \mu_3^i \delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4^i) + \ldots \tag{35}$$

where again the ellipses denote the contribution of orientifold planes (one may also have D3 branes that do not end on the D5 brane). The relative coefficients of this Bianchi identity in fact cannot be altered. As seen above the relative coefficients of the second and the third term depends on the T-duality relation $\mu_3/\mu_5 = 2\pi$, and the relative coefficient and sign between the first and second terms is determined by gauge invariance. This may be checked [30] by using the formula $d^2 = 0$ and (27) where the latter was fixed by the anomaly inflow argument. The point is that once the action is defined to be (34) gauge invariance (and T-duality) fixes the Bianchi identity, and it cannot be modified on the grounds that the equation of motion for C_4 needs to be modified because of self-duality. Integrating over the internal manifold X (and assuming for simplicity that there is only the one pair of crossed fluxes and only the D (Dbar) 3-branes that end on the D5 brane) we find (3). As observed above as one goes from the outside to the inside of the bubble $M \to M + 1$, so that (using (33) we have the (dual of the) phenomenon discussed in [4] of branes being replaced by flux and vice-versa.

Thus we might have had a representation in terms of an action for the BT process with the self-duality imposed at the level of the equations of motion, if not for the fact that the equation of motion for C_4 in the coupled brane-bulk action and the self duality condition lead to a result that is inconsistent with the correct Bianchi identity. As far as we are aware there is no Lorentz invariant formalism that can fix this problem.

B. Type IIA

Flux compactification in type IIA string theory has been discussed by [10][11][12]. As in the previous subsection we will try to write down an action that describes processes which describe transitions between different flux vacua. Unlike the case of IIB there is no reason to expect a problem in this since there is no self duality constraint.

The bulk action for the p-form fields is (again with $2\pi\alpha' = 1$ and a frozen axio-dilaton)

$$\begin{aligned} S \;=\; & -\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\Big[\int_{M_{10}} (F_0 \wedge *F_0 + F_2 \wedge *F_2 + H_3 \wedge *H_3 + F_4 \wedge *F_4) \\ & + \int_{D_{11}} F_4 \wedge F_4 \wedge H_3\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

As befits a topological term the last one in the above expression is integrated over a disc whose boundary is the 10 Dimensional manifold $\partial D_{11} = M_{10}$. It is independent of the

particular D_{11} because the integrand is closed due to the Bianchi identities which are

$$dH_3 = 0,\, dF_0 \;=\; 0,\, dF_2 = F_0 H_3, \tag{37}$$

$$dF_4 \;=\; F_2 \wedge H_3. \tag{38}$$

The Bianchi identities are solved (locally) by

$$F_2 = dC_1 + F_0 B_2,\;\; F_4 = dC_3 - H_3 \wedge C_1 + \tfrac{F_0}{2} B_2 \wedge B_2, \tag{39}$$

$$F_0 = m_0 = \text{const.} \tag{40}$$

The gauge invariances of this system are as follows:

$$\delta B_2 = d\Lambda_1,\, \delta C_1 = d\Lambda_0 - m_0 \Lambda_1,\, \delta C_3 = d\Lambda_2 - H_3 \Lambda_0 - m_0 B_2 \wedge \Lambda_1. \tag{41}$$

In the IIB case the branes that can be electrically coupled were D3 and D1 branes. In IIA we can only couple D2 and D0 branes. In order to couple higher branes we need to use the same trick as in the IIB case. For the moment we will ignore eight branes and D-particles, set $m_0 = 0$ and write down the effective terms for D6, D4 and D2 branes. These are,

$$I_6 \;=\; \frac{\mu_6}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_7} [\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!} \wedge C_3 - \frac{\mathcal{F}_2^3}{3!} \wedge C_1], \tag{42}$$

$$I_4 \;=\; \frac{\mu_4}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_5} [-\mathcal{F}_2 \wedge C_3 + \frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!} \wedge C_1], \tag{43}$$

$$I_2 \;=\; \frac{\mu_2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_3} \int [C_3 - \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge C_1], \tag{44}$$

with $\mu_6 = \sqrt{2\pi} q$, $\mu_4 = (2\pi)^{3/2} q$, $\mu_2 = (2\pi)^{5/2} q$, $q = \pm 1, 0$. As in the IIB case there is an anomaly in these actions that has to be cancelled by inflow from the bulk

$$\delta I_6 = -\frac{\mu_6}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_7} \Lambda_2 \wedge \mathcal{F}_2 \wedge H_3,\, \delta I_4 = -\frac{\mu_4}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{W_5} \Lambda_2 \wedge H_3. \tag{45}$$

Again there is at first sight an ambiguity in how the WZNW term can be split up, but as in the IIB case consistency of the Bianchi identities fixes this. The crucial identity is the one for F_2 which can be fixed by T duality from the corresponding identity (27) whose validity was established in turn by the consistency of the IIB equations with the self-duality constraint and anomaly inflow. Thus we argue that

$$dF_2 = \mu_6 \delta_3(M_{10} \to W_7). \tag{46}$$

Note that as in the IIB case this is precisely what we would have got if we just had a bulk action $\int F_8 \wedge *F_8$ coupled to $\int_{W_7} C_7$ but as in that case it is not possible to have this in the IIA action given that we need also the lower rank forms.

At least for trivial fluxes the topological term in (36) can be rewritten as a ten dimensional integral

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{M_{10}} C_3 \wedge F_4 \wedge H_3$$

Then as in the IIB case the ambiguity gets fixed with $\lambda = 2$ (see discussion between (21) and (26)) so that the topological term gets split up as

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int C_3 \wedge F_4 \wedge H_3 \to -\int C_3 \wedge F_4 \wedge H_3 + \frac{1}{2}\int C_3 \wedge F_4' \wedge H_3, \tag{47}$$

where $dF_4' = F_2 \wedge H_3$ and

$$dF_4 = \mu_6 \mathcal{F}_2 \delta_3(M_{10} \to W_7) + \mu_4 \delta_5(M_{10} \to W_5) + F_2 \wedge H_3 \tag{48}$$

It is consistency with $d^2 = 0$ and (46) that enabled us to fix $\lambda = 2$ as in the IIB case. As before the source terms in (48) give an anomaly in the gauge transformation of (47) which cancels the anomaly of the D6 and D4 brane actions (45).

Let us now turn on F_0 flux. First let us discuss the corresponding processes by constructing a consistent set of Bianchi identities. Then we will investigate whether there is a bulk plus brane action to describe them.

From the foregoing discussion the Bianchi identities in the presence of six branes (for simplicity we'll not introduce 4- or 2-branes) are changed from (37)(38) to

$$dH_3 = 0, \qquad dF_2 = H_3 F_0 + \sum_i \mu_6^i \delta_3(M_{10} \to W_7^i), \tag{49}$$

$$dF_4 \;=\; H_3 \wedge F_2 + \sum_i \mu_6^i \mathcal{F}_2 \delta_3(M_{10} \to W_7^i). \tag{50}$$

Note that we have now generalized to a set of six-branes. Suppose the six-branes wrap the 3+1 external dimensions and a three cycle (α) in the Calabi-Yau manifold X. Integrating the second of (49) over the dual cycle β we get (since F_2 is globally defined)

$$0 = \int_\beta dF_2 = m_0 \int_\beta H_3 + \sum_i \mu_6 \tag{51}$$

This relation was observed in [12]. It tells us that if a net number of six branes wrapping a three cycle are present then we need to have non-zero F_0 flux and also put H_3 flux through

the dual cycle. Given the flux quantization

$$\int_\beta H_3 = 2\pi p,\ p\epsilon\mathcal{Z} \tag{52}$$

we get

$$2\pi m_0 p = \sqrt{2\pi}N \tag{53}$$

Note that this relation is only consistent if m_0 is quantized in units of $1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ a fact that can be established independently by coupling eight branes as we shall see later. In the context of type I' theory a similar result was observed in [13].

The interesting processes are those which changes the ten-form flux m_0. These would change the ten dimensional cosmological constant and are caused by nucleated eight-branes. A consistent set of Bianchi identities in the presence of both eight and six branes is (henceforth the wedge product symbol should be understood from the context)

$$dF_0 = \mu_8\delta_1, \tag{54}$$

$$dF_2 = F_0H_3 + \mu_8\mathcal{F}_2\delta_1 + \mu_6\delta_3, \tag{55}$$

$$dF_4 = F_2H_3 + \mu_8\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\delta_1 + \mu_6\mathcal{F}_2\delta_3 + \mu_4\delta_5. \tag{56}$$

In the above $\delta_1 = \delta_1(M_{10} \to W_9)$, $\delta_3 = \delta_3(M_{10} \to W_7)$, $\delta_5 = \delta_5(M_{10} \to W_5)$, where the W_i are the world volumes of the 8-, 6-, and 4-branes. Also $\mu_8 = q/\sqrt{2\pi}$, $q = \pm 1, 0$.

The consistency of these Bianchi identities can be easily checked by operating with the exterior derivative and using $d\mathcal{F}_2 = H_3$. It should be noted that the existence of the eight-brane, signaled by the non-zero RHS of (54) necessitates the eight-brane terms in the other two Bianchi identities. In passing we note that the system cannot accommodate a NS five brane since an equation of the form

$$dH_3 = \mu_5\delta_4(M_{10} \to W_6)$$

would be incompatible with (55)(56) as the above consistency check depended on having $dH_3 = 0$.

Let us now consider the concrete framework for moduli stabilization in [12]. This has D6 branes O6 planes and F_0, $*F_4$ and H_3 flux. First consider the nucleation of an eight brane wrapping a two sphere S_2 in non-compact space and the whole Calabi-Yau X in this set up. Integrating (54) over a line R going from inside to the outside of the S_2 in the radial

direction,

$$\Delta F_0 = m_0^{\rm out} - m_0^{\rm in} = \mu_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \tag{57}$$

This implies that m_0 is quantized in units of $1/\sqrt{2\pi}$ in agreement with our earlier argument. Integrating (55) over the the three cycle β that is dual to that wrapped by the six brane we get (after putting $m_0 = m/\sqrt{2\pi}$, $m\varepsilon\mathcal{Z}$) equation (53) rewritten as

$$mp + N = 0 \tag{58}$$

where as before $N = N_{D6} - N_{O6}$. In crossing the nucleated 8-brane domain wall $m \to m \pm 1$, so in order to maintain the above equation the number of D6 branes must change,

$$N \to N \mp p. \tag{59}$$

In attempts to create standard-like models from type IIA the gauge group comes from a stack of D6-branes. The above process will result in changing the gauge group.

While this discussion shows that once six or eight branes are nucleated various interesting processes (which change fluxes and the number of branes) can take place, the nucleation itself is a quantum process and at the very least one should expect that there be an action that is able to describe this process. In the IIB case we argued that there is no consistent action essentially because of the self-duality problem even if we use the anomaly inflow argument. Above we showed that in IIA in the absence of F_0 flux it is possible to get an action for six branes magnetically coupled to the bulk action by using anomaly inflow from the bulk to the brane. However as we've discussed above flux stabilization of moduli in IIA requires us to turn on F_0 flux. Furthermore nucleation of eight branes will cause this flux to jump. So it is imperative to have an action that incorporates eight branes as well as six and four branes in the presence of non-zero F_0 flux. Below we will try to construct such an action.

The main problem is to write the topological term in the bulk action in such a way that, in the presence of sources, its anomalies will cancel the anomaly of the magnetically coupled higher dimensional branes, where the latter are written only in terms of the fields in the bulk action. The term in question is (see (36))

$$S_{top} = -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\int_{D_{11}} H_3 F_4 F_4.$$

As we mentioned earlier this term is well defined in the absence of magnetically coupled branes. In the presence of such sources however the integrand is not closed so we have to

find a way to define this term properly. In order to do so we will first reexpress this term (in the absence of magnetic couplings) as a ten dimensional integral by writing

$$F_4 = dC_3 - H_3 C_1 + F_0^b \frac{B_2^2}{2!} + F_4^b,\ dF_4^b = 0,\ F_2 = dC_1,\ H_3 = dB_2 + H_3^b \tag{60}$$

Here we have included a background flux term for the four form (and we've renamed the background zero form flux $F_0^b \equiv m_0^{out}$) and NS three form flux. The stabilization discussed in [12] actually requires both four form and NS three form flux but if we have both there will be extra (closed) terms which are necessarily eleven dimensional but will not affect the argument below. With the above we can write (after some algebra) the topological term as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{top} &= -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\int_{D_{11}} H_3 F_4 F_4 = -\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}} [\frac{1}{2} C_3 H_3 (F_4 + F_4^b) + \frac{1}{2} B_2 F_4^b F_4^b \\ &- \frac{1}{2} C_3 H_3 F_0^b \frac{B_2^2}{2!} - F_4 F_0^b \frac{B_2^3}{3!} + F_2 F_0^b \frac{B_2^4}{4!} - 2(F_0^b)^2 \frac{B_2^5}{5!} + \ldots] \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The ellipses indicate terms having a factor of H_3^b which will not be changed in the presence of magnetic couplings to D-branes, so that we do not need their explicit expression for what follows. The gauge invariant expression for the coupling of RR fields to a p- brane is [14]

$$I = \frac{\mu_p}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_{p+1}} \{\mathbf{C} e^{-(f_2 + B_2)} + F_0 \sum_r \frac{(-1)^r}{(r+1)!}\omega_{2r+1}(f_2, a)\}. \tag{62}$$

Here $\mathbf{C}$ is the formal sum of all the RR fields and ω is the Chern-Simons form for the gauge field a. We are of course ignoring the gravitational anomaly contribution which is irrelevant to our discussion. In addition to the usual RR and NS transformations this action is invariant under the additional NSNS transformations that are present (see Appendix A) when there is constant zero form flux ($dF_0 = 0,\ F_0 \neq 0$)

$$\delta \mathbf{C} = -F_0 e^{B_2} \Lambda_1. \tag{63}$$

As before since the bulk action does not contain the higher form fields we need to use the anomaly inflow mechanism to get a gauge invariant bulk plus brane action. Let us see how this works for the coupling of the D8 brane. Since the other branes are contained in this one it is sufficient to demonstrate the mechanism for this case. The first step is to rewrite (as with the other cases) the D8 action by removing the terms which are dependent on gauge fields of rank higher than four since these are not contained in the bulk action. The terms

which are removed are,

$$\Delta I_8 = \frac{\mu_8}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{W_9}[C_9 - C_7\mathcal{F}_2 + C_5\frac{\mathcal{F}_2}{2!}] \tag{64}$$

Under RR and NSNS gauge transformations we have using (see Appendix A)

$$\delta C_9 = d\Lambda_8 - H_3\Lambda_6 - F_0^b\frac{B^4}{4!}\Lambda_1, \text{ etc.} \tag{65}$$

(and after some cancellations) the anomaly that needs to flow in from the bulk,

$$\delta\Delta I_8 = \frac{\mu_8}{(2\pi)^3}\int[-H_3\Lambda_2\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!} - F_0^b(\frac{B^4}{4!} - \frac{B^3}{3!}\mathcal{F}_2 + \frac{B^2}{2!}\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!})\Lambda_1]. \tag{66}$$

Now the question is whether the bulk topological term can provide this inflow. As we discussed before the topological term (written as an 11-dimensional integral over a disc) is well defined only if the integrand is closed. This is so because H_3 is closed and the RR field strengths are d_H closed. In the presence of magnetic sources (i.e. 4, 6 or 8-branes) however the RR field strengths are not d_H closed. The question is whether the resulting ambiguity can be resolved so that the anomaly of the truncated D-brane action is cancelled.

The unique way of doing this is to rewrite the topological term (in its ten dimensional form (61) as follows (ignoring terms involving H_3^b):

$$\begin{aligned} S_{top} \;=\; & \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}}[-C_3H_3F_4 + \frac{1}{2}C_3H_3F_4' - \frac{1}{2}B_2F_4^bF_4^b \\ & + \frac{1}{2}C_3H_3F_0^b\frac{B_2^2}{2!} - F_4F_0^b\frac{B_2^3}{3!} + F_2F_0^b\frac{B_2^4}{4!} + (F_0^b)^2\frac{B_2^5}{5!} + F_0^bF_0\frac{B_2^5}{5!}] \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

F_4^b, F_0^b, are taken to be the background values of these fluxes at infinity (i.e. outside the nucleated D8-brane) and F_4' is defined as $F_4' = dC_3 - H_3C_1 + F_0^b\frac{B_2^2}{2!} + F_4^b$ (see (60)). F_4,F_2 and F_0 satisfy the Bianchi identities

$$dF_0 = \mu_8\delta_1, \qquad dF_2 - F_0H_3 = \mu_8\mathcal{F}_2\delta_1 \tag{68}$$

$$dF_4 - F_2H_3 \;=\; \mu_8\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\delta_1 \tag{69}$$

So as was the case in IIB (see discussion after (22) we may write (defining θ_i, $i = 0, 2, 5$) to be coexact solutions of the three Bianchi identities (68,69)

$$F_0 = F_0^b + \theta_0,\; F_2 = dC_1 + \theta_2,\; F_4 = F_4' + \theta_4. \tag{70}$$

The gauge transformations are given in (41). The non-zero right hand sides of these equations imply that there is an anomaly in the bulk topological term (67) given by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{anom}S_{top} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}}[-\Lambda_2 H_3 dF_4 + dF_4 F_0^b \frac{B_2^2}{2!}\Lambda_1 - dF_2 F_0^b \frac{B_2^3}{3!}\Lambda_1 - dF_0 F_0^b \frac{B_2^4}{4!}\Lambda_1]|_{anom} \\ &= \frac{\mu_8}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{M_{10}}[-H_3\Lambda_2\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!} - F_0^b\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\frac{B_2^2}{2!}\Lambda_1 + F_0^b\mathcal{F}_2\frac{B_2^3}{3!}\Lambda_1 - F_0^b\frac{B_2^4}{4!}\Lambda_1]\delta_1. \qquad (71)\end{aligned}$$

The delta function at the end just restricts the integral to the eight-brane world volume so that this is exactly equal to (66). In other words the anomaly in the source action coming from restricting the gauge fields to those that are present in the bulk lagrangian, is cancelled by anomaly inflow from the bulk.

In spite of the cancellation of anomalies that we have demonstrated above, the action (in particular the topological term (67)) is not written in a background independent way. It is not clear that it is possible to do this in a Lorentz invariant fashion. This of course was the problem in the IIB case as well. However in the IIA case we do have an action with the bulk coupled to the higher dimensional branes that can be used to compute the quantum fluctuations around a given background [31].

III. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have looked at the dynamics of transitions between different flux vacua (for a given Calabi-Yau compactification). Our arguments imply that even though there are classical configurations that can divide the universe into different regions, with different numbers of branes and flux values, it is difficult to find a Lorentz invariant background independent supergravity action that includes the bulk theory and the nucleated higher dimensional branes. This means that it is hard to see how to describe the quantum mechanical process that causes transitions between such regions. In other words it is not entirely clear that there is no superselection rule that forbids such transitions so that each point of the landscape is simply a different sector isolated from the rest. If this is true there is no need to assign reality to the whole landscape. In other words one might think that finding a standard model with a nearly zero cosmological constant etc. is really nothing more than just fitting the data. Philosophically this would be no different from what particle physicists were doing in the 70's and 80's i.e. GUT model building.

On the other hand unlike in these field theories, here there are classical configurations where the universe is separated by domain walls into regions with different values of the fundamental constants number of generations etc. So it is conceivable that even though within the low-energy approximation we have not been able to find a quantum description of this brane nucleation process, in that a background independent Lorentz invariant supergravity action does not seem to exist, the full string theory may still admit such processes. For instance it is likely that, since the brane actions that we have been using are really valid effective descriptions only at scales which are long compared to the string scale, and the gauge invariance problems that we have highlighted occur at the locations of the branes, a proper string theoretic description of the brane (for instance as a soliton in a string field theory) should automatically take care of this problem.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Rob Myers for very useful discussions and Oliver DeWolfe for stimulating comments on the manuscript. I also wish to thank Dima Belov and Greg Moore for discussions (and the former also for correspondence about their work [15]) that stimulated this revised version. In addition I wish to thank Ben Shlaer for discussions. Finally I wish to thank the Aspen center for physics and KITP Santa Barbara for hospitality while this paper was being revised. This work is supported by DOE grant No. DE-FG02-91-ER-40672 and the Perimeter Institute.

Appendix A: The dual form of the IIA action

In this appendix we will first discuss a formal self-dual action and then a dual form of the IIA action that might be suitable for coupling to the higher dimensional branes [16]. Define (for type IIA) the formal sum of forms

$$\mathbf{A} = \sum_{n=1}^{5} A_{2n-1},\ \mathbf{F} = \sum_{n=0}^{5} F_{2n} \tag{72}$$

with a similar sum over even (odd) rank gauge fields (field strengths) for type IIB. $\mathbf{F}$ satisfies the Bianchi identity

$$d\mathbf{F} = H_3\mathbf{F}$$

The usual form of the gauge fields (used in the text) is obtained by substituting $\mathbf{A} = e^{-B_2}\mathbf{C}$. Also (locally) we solve the Bianchi identities by

$$\mathbf{F} = (d\mathbf{A} + F_0)e^B = d\mathbf{C} - H_3\mathbf{C} + F_0 e^{B_2}. \tag{73}$$

The action is

$$(2\pi)^3 S = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{M_{10}} (|\mathbf{F}|^2 + |H_3|^2) \tag{74}$$

The RR gauge transformations are $\delta\mathbf{A} = d\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$, ($\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}} = \sum_{n=0}^{4}\tilde{\Lambda}_{2n}$) and the NSNS gauge transformations are

$$\delta B_2 \;=\; d\Lambda_1,\; \delta\mathbf{A} = -F_0\Lambda_1 - d\Lambda_1\mathbf{A}$$

The corresponding gauge transformations for $\mathbf{C}$ are (with $\mathbf{\Lambda} = e^{B_2}\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$)

$$\delta_{RR}\mathbf{C} \;=\; d\mathbf{\Lambda} - H_3\mathbf{\Lambda} \tag{75}$$

$$\delta_{NS}\mathbf{C} \;=\; -F_0 e^{B_2}\Lambda_1 \tag{76}$$

One may couple the branes to this as in (62). This is of course gauge invariant (provided $dF_0 = 0$). However this bulk plus brane action has too many degrees of freedom since it has both electric and magnetic terms which are dual to each other. To cut them down we need to impose the self duality condition

$$\mathbf{F} = (-1)^n * \mathbf{F}$$

at the level of the equations of motion. Note that we cannot put this in the action even for type IIA since if we did so there would be no dynamics for the gauge field $\mathbf{A}$ (see (73) - in IIB of course this term would vanish because the wedge product of an odd form with itself vanishes). As observed by the authors of [16] this is not a proper action for the quantum theory since the latter must propagate only the physical degrees of freedom.

A suggestion for such an action in [16] is,

$$\begin{aligned}(2\pi)^3 S_{IIA} \;=\; & -\frac{1}{2}\int_{M_{10}} \{(|H_3|^2 + |F_0|^2 + |F_2|^2 + |F_4|^2) - F_4F_4B_2 \\ & +\; F_4F_2B_2^2 - \frac{1}{3}F_2^2B_2^2 - \frac{1}{3}F_0F_4B_2^3 + \frac{1}{4}F_0F_2B_2^4 - \frac{1}{20}F_0^2B_2^5 \\ & -\; 2F_0dA_9 + 2(F_2 - B_2F_0)dA_7 - 2(F_4 - B_2F_2 + \frac{1}{2}B_2^2F_0)dA_5\}\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Here the field strength $H_3 = dB_2$, but the RR field strengths are taken to be independent "black box" fields. The Lagrange multiplier fields A_i are designed to enforce the Bianchi identities for these RR fields but they are also the fields which are supposed to be sourced by the higher dimensional branes. Under RR gauge transformations F_i are invariant and

$$\delta A_9 = d\Lambda_8,\ \delta A_7 = d\Lambda_6,\ \delta A_5 = d\Lambda_4.$$

The NSNS gauge transformations (and supersymmetry transformations) are realized only on the formal sum of all the form fields.

This is however not a suitable action for our purposes. For instance If we couple an eight-brane the WZNW part of the action will be

$$I_8 = \mu_8 \int_{W_9} (e^{-f_2}\mathbf{A} - \frac{f^4}{4!}aF_0) = \mu_8 \int_{W_9} (A_9 - A_7 f_2 + A_5\frac{f_2^2}{2!} - A_3\frac{f_2^3}{3!} + \ldots) \tag{78}$$

where as before $f_2 = da$ is the world volume gauge field strength which transforms as $\delta f_2 = -d\Lambda_1$, under NSNS gauge transformations. Note that this field cannot be set to zero in string theory. The important point here is that gauge invariance necessitates the presence of all the lower dimensional branes. The bulk action however is independent of the corresponding fields A_3 and A_1 and so variation with respect to these will only be consistent with the absence of eight branes. The same is the case for six-branes and four-branes. Thus this form of the action is not really suitable for coupling higher dimensional branes.

Appendix B: A background independent action for IIA

In this appendix we discuss the work of Belov and Moore [15] - though in a mathematically unsophisticated fashion. Define (for type IIA) the formal sum of forms as in the previous appendix:

$$\mathbf{C} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} C_{2n-1},\ \mathbf{F} = \sum_{i=0}^{5} F_{2n} \tag{79}$$

Write the bulk action for the RR gauge fields as (again setting the dilaton to zero) [17, 18], [15]

$$(2\pi)^3 S = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{M_{10}} (F_0 * F_0 + F_2 * F_2 + F_4 * F_4) \tag{80}$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{M_{10}} (F_0 F_{10} - F_2 F_8 + F_4 F_6). \tag{81}$$

Here all products are wedge products and the field strengths are required to obey the Bianchi identities

$$d\mathbf{F} - H_3\mathbf{F} \equiv d_H\mathbf{F} = 0. \tag{82}$$

Locally, in the absence of sources, we have the solution (73).

As it stands the above action is not well defined without choosing a Lagrangian subspace of the space of gauge fields which tells us how F_6, F_8, F_{10} are related to F_0, F_2, F_4. However in the absence of sources it is completely equivalent to the standard form of the action (36). This is because the topological term in the action (with $M_{10} = \partial D_{11}$) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}(2\pi)^3 S_{top} &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{D_{11}} d(F_0F_{10} - F_2F_8 + F_4F_6) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{D_{11}} (F_0H_3F_8 - H_3F_0F_8 - F_2H_3F_6 \ + H_3F_2F_6 + F_4H_3F_4) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{D_{11}} H_3F_4F_4. \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Here to get the second line we used the Bianchi identities. This is the usual form of the topological term. In the presence of sources the last expression is not well defined by itself since the integrand is not closed. The starting point (81) is well-defined provided a choice of a Lagrangian submanifold is made. Now Belov and Moore introduce a "trivialization" of the D-brane current. Let us pursue an alternate strategy which illustrates the problems of trying to retain the usual formulation of the action. Doing the above calculation, using now the Bianchi identities with sources

$$d_H\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{j}, \tag{84}$$

where

$$\mathbf{j} = \sum_{r=1}^{5} j_{2r-1},$$

we get the following additional terms in the last two lines of (83) :

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{D_{11}} (F_{10}j_1 - F_8j_3 + F_6j_5 + F_4j_7 - F_2j_9). \tag{85}$$

Note that since $d_H^2 = 0$ the sources must satisfy $d_H\mathbf{j} = 0$. Explicitly we have the following expressions for these sources

$$\begin{aligned} j_1 &= \mu_8\delta_1,\ j_3 = \mu_8\mathcal{F}_2\delta_1 - \mu_6\delta_3,\ j_5 = \mu_8\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\delta_1 - \mu_6\mathcal{F}_2\delta_3 + \mu_4\delta_5 \\ j_7 &= \mu_8\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^3}{3!}\delta_1 - \mu_6\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\delta_3 + \mu_4\mathcal{F}_2\delta_5 - \mu_2\delta_7 \\ j_9 &= \mu_8\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^4}{4!}\delta_1 - \mu_6\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^3}{3!}\delta_3 + \mu_4\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!}\delta_5 - \mu_2\mathcal{F}_2\delta_7 + \mu_0\delta_9 \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

where $\mu_p = (2\pi)^{\frac{7-p}{2}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_2 = B_2 + f_2$, with $f_2 = da_1$ where a_1 is the world volume gauge field of D-branes which transforms as $\delta f_2 = -d\Lambda_1$, under NSNS gauge transformations. Also δ_{2r-1} is a delta function $2r-1$ form which has support on the $11-2r$ dimensional world volume of a $10-2r$ dimensional D-brane. The source action may then be written as

$$(2\pi)^3 I = \sum_{r=0}^{4} \mu_{2r} \int_{W_{2r+1}} (\mathbf{C}e^{-\mathcal{F}_2} - F_0 \frac{(-f)^r}{r+1!} a) = \int_{M_{10}} (\mathbf{C}\bar{j} - F_0 \sum_{r=0}^{4} \frac{(-f)^r}{(r+1)!} a\delta|_{9-2r}) \tag{87}$$

where $\delta = \sum_{r=0}^{4} \mu_{8-2r}\delta_{2r+1}$ and $\bar{j} = \sum_{r=0}(-1)^r j_{2r+1}$. From the fact that locally on the brane we have (73) and that $\bar{j}$ satisfies the identity

$$\bar{dj} \equiv d\bar{j} + H_3\bar{j} = 0 \tag{88}$$

we get $d(C\bar{j}) = F\bar{j} - C\bar{dj} - F_0 e^B\bar{j} = F\bar{j} - F_0 e^B\bar{j}$. Using also the explicit form of $\bar{j}$ (with the defining formal sum extended to 11 dimensions ($r=5$) with $j_{11} = (e^{-\mathcal{F}_2}\delta)_{11}$) we get

$$I = \int_{D_{11}} \mathbf{F}\bar{j} \tag{89}$$

Now if we add these source terms with half strength to the bulk action we have from (85)

$$(2\pi)^3(S_{WZ} + \frac{1}{2}I) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{D_{11}} H_3F_4F_4 - \int_{D_{11}} (F_4 j_7 - F_2 j_9 - F_0 j_{11}) \tag{90}$$

Thus the higher form fields have disappeared since the source terms are truncated (as in the anomaly inflow argument). The sum is of course manifestly gauge invariant and well defined (once a Lagrangian subspace has been chosen [15]) since we started from a ten-dimensional action which just depended on the curvatures, to which the local gauge invariant action (87) was added. However some comments are in order. Firstly the source terms cannot now be written as world sheet integrals anymore unless the coupling of the higher branes (D4, D6 and D8) is turned off. Thus if $\mu_8 = \mu_4 = \mu_2 = 0$ we have for the second term in (90)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{D_{11}} [\mu_2(F_4 - F_2\mathcal{F}_2 + F_0\frac{\mathcal{F}_2^2}{2!})\delta_7 \ + \ \mu_0(F_2 - \mathcal{F}_2F_0)\delta_9] \\
&= \int_{M_{10}} [\mu_2(C_3 - \mathcal{F}_2C_1 + F_0\frac{f_2a_1}{2!})\delta_7 \ + \ \mu_0(C_1 - F_0a)\delta_9] \\
&= \int_{W_3} (C_3 - \mathcal{F}_2C_1 + F_0\frac{f_2a}{2!}) \ + \ \int_{W_1} (C_1 - F_0a)
\end{aligned}$$

But there is no corresponding world volume integral representation of the higher dimensional branes. This appears to be the price that has to be paid to have an action which is

independent of the base point in contrast to our previous discussion which had Dirac string singularities. In other words one can as in the text introduce particular solutions of $d_H\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{J}$ (trivializations of $\mathbf{J}$) to rewrite the topological terms as integrals over the ten manifold M_{10}. This is what is done in [15] - though in a very elegant geometrical fashion. They have also argued that the action is in some sense independent of this trivialization.

It should be remarked that although the topological terms for the branes have been added with half strength (90) the DBI term must be added with full strength. It is only then that the usual (kappa invariant BPS) form of the brane action is obtained when coupled to the usual form of the bulk action with lower dimensional branes. In other words the bulk action (80)(81) needs to be coupled to a brane action which is not manifestly BPS in that the charge is apparently half the tension. This is a reflection of the fact that some of the brane topological terms are hidden in the bulk topological term.

The above discussion shows that it is not possible to write the standard form of the background independent bulk action with a coupling to higher dimensional branes unless the latter are written in a non-local form. As shown above for the lower dimensional electrically coupled branes it is possible to rewrite them in the local form, but not for the magnetically coupled branes. Of course the bulk action in the form (80)(81) coupled to the local action (87) is indeed in a background independent form, but it is not properly defined unless a Lagrangian submanifold is chosen [15]. It is not clear that this can be done in a Lorentz invariant and background independent fashion.

---

[1] J. D. Brown and C. Teitelboim, Nucl. Phys. **B297**, 787 (1988).

[2] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **06**, 006 (2000), hep-th/0004134.

[3] J. L. Feng, J. March-Russell, S. Sethi, and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B602**, 307 (2001), hep-th/0005276.

[4] S. Kachru, J. Pearson, and H. L. Verlinde, JHEP **06**, 021 (2002), hep-th/0112197.

[5] A. R. Frey, M. Lippert, and B. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 046008 (2003), hep-th/0305018.

[6] E. Witten, J. Geom. Phys. **22**, 103 (1997), hep-th/9610234.

[7] J. Polchinski, String theory. Vol. 2: Superstring theory and beyond (1998), cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1998) 531 p.

[8] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru, and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 106006 (2002), hep-th/0105097.

[9] S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 7963 (1997), hep-th/9705139.

[10] T. W. Grimm and J. Louis, Nucl. Phys. **B718**, 153 (2005), hep-th/0412277.

[11] G. Villadoro and F. Zwirner, JHEP **06**, 047 (2005), hep-th/0503169.

[12] O. DeWolfe, A. Giryavets, S. Kachru, and W. Taylor, JHEP **07**, 066 (2005), hep-th/0505160.

[13] J. Polchinski and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B460**, 525 (1996), hep-th/9510169.

[14] M. B. Green, C. M. Hull, and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **B382**, 65 (1996), hep-th/9604119.

[15] D. Belov and G. W. Moore (2006), hep-th/0611020.

[16] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, T. Ortin, D. Roest, and A. Van Proeyen, Class. Quant. Grav. **18**, 3359 (2001), hep-th/0103233.

[17] G. W. Moore and N. Saulina, Nucl. Phys. **B670**, 27 (2003), hep-th/0206092.

[18] D.-E. Diaconescu, G. W. Moore, and E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6**, 1031 (2003), hep-th/0005090.

[19] T. Mohaupt and F. Saueressig, JCAP **0501**, 006 (2005), hep-th/0410273.

[20] A. Lukas, E. Palti, and P. M. Saffin, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 066001 (2005), hep-th/0411033.

[21] T. Mohaupt and F. Saueressig, Fortsch. Phys. **53**, 522 (2005), hep-th/0501164.

[22] M. Cariglia and K. Lechner, Nucl. Phys. **B700**, 157 (2004), hep-th/0406083.

[23] D. Belov and G. W. Moore (2006), hep-th/0605038.

[24] S. P. de Alwis, Phys. Lett. **B413**, 49 (1997), hep-th/9706142.

[25] For a discussion of this in a mini-superspace (cosmological) context see [19][20][21].

[26] A discussion of IIB coupling to branes using the PST formalism, which can be used if the manifold is topologically trivial, is given in [22]. A discussion of a non-Lorentz invariant formalism that is valid in topologically non-trivial manifolds is given in [23].

[27] This corrects a statement in an earlier draft of this paper. I thank Dima Belov and Greg Moore for suggestions that led me to find the relevant extra terms in the bulk action.

[28] Note that the extra topological term which arises under this substitution does not contributed to the equation of motion and may be omitted.

[29] This method was for coupling higher dimensional branes to the bulk was discussed in the context of M-theory in [9, 24].

[30] In checking this we need to use the formula $d\delta_6(M_{10} \to W_4) = \delta_7(M \to \partial W_4)$. When the world volume has no boundary the right hand side is zero.

[31] In Appendix B we discuss an elegant geometrical formulation due to Belov and Moore [15] where considerable progress towards achieving a background independent formulation is made.